I want a strong farm safety net program that helps farmers weather downturns in the market and survive natural disasters, but I do not want an unending stream of payments with no caps.

This amendment aims to help large farms get large bailouts while small farmers are left behind. Instead of fundamentally changing market dynamics, we should work together to make sure small and medium sized farmers do not get left behind in farm payment programs. This is especially true as we go into farm bill discussions in the next Congress.

OMNIBUS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this bill, the Consolidated Appropriations Act of FY23, addresses an issue that I have been dealing with for well over a decade, since I was Louisiana State Treasurer. The U.S. Treasury Department is sitting on nearly $30 billion in mature, unredeemed savings bonds, issued years or decades ago to hard-working Americans who wanted to invest in America. States, who have long held the responsibility of holding and making available lost assets, have tried to subject these savings bonds to the time-honored, reliable escheatment and unclaimed property process. At every turn, their efforts have been opposed by Treasury, which has also rebuffed any offers from the States to use their vast capabilities to help reunite bondholders or their rightful heirs to these funds. Instead, Treasury has made its own attempts at digitizing and updating its voluminous bondholder records and creating a database for users—efforts which have failed to make any meaningful dent in the amounts of unredeemed debt, according to their own status report.

This bill includes a provision that directs Treasury to provide States with information relating to bond purchases, including the name, applicable address, co-owners or beneficiaries, and the bond serial numbers which claimants often need to reclaim their funds. I understand that Treasury has said it may not have enough data in its records to match the serial numbers with the name and address of the bondholder; this is why the bill's language includes some flexibility, stating that the information Treasury must provide to States ''may'' include bond serial numbers. This wording allows Treasury to use its discretion in the limited instances when it is incapable of providing those numbers, but the overall language makes clear that Treasury is obligated to make every effort to locate relevant and necessary information and provide it to the correct States. I expect Treasury to issue regulations which will fulfill these responsibilities.

The bill's definitions ensure that this will cover both paper and paperless bonds—and I want to clarify also includes bonds that were issued in paper but have been lost, stolen, or destroyed. Treasury's own 2021 report on mature unredeemed debt describes the process for bond owners who have the necessary information but not the paper document itself as lengthy, complex, and a hindrance that discourages claimants. The clear purpose of this legislation is to make this process simpler by opening it up to States, and Treasury should issue regulations reflecting this intent.

PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, the purpose of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is to help pregnant mothers in the workplace receive accommodations so that they can maintain a healthy pregnancy and childbirth. Therefore, I want to make clear for the record that the terms ''pregnancy'' and ''related medical conditions,'' for which accommodations to their known limitations are required under the legislation, do not include abortion.

On December 8, the sponsor of this legislation, Senator BOB CASEY stated on the Senate floor as follows: ''I want to say for the record, however, that under the act, under the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, the Equal Opportunity Employment Commission, the EEOC, could not—could not—issue any regulation that requires abortion leave, nor does the act permit the EEOC to require employers to provide abortions in violation of State law.''

Senator CASEY's statement reflects the intent of Congress in advancing the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act today. This legislation should not be misconstrued by the EEOC or Federal courts to impose abortion-related mandates on employers, or otherwise to promote abortions, contrary to the intent of Congress.

PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I wish to expand upon the remarks I delivered earlier today on the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, which this body voted to include in the omnibus spending package. I first introduced this bill in 2012 with Senator SHAHEEN. Senator CASSIDY joined us this Congress, and the bill now has broad, bipartisan support.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is a very straightforward piece of legislation; it closes a loophole in the 1978 Pregnancy Discrimination Act to allow pregnant workers to request reasonable accommodations so that they can continue working safely during pregnancy and upon returning to work after childbirth. This is a commonsense bill that has broad, bipartisan support—everyone from the ACLU to the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops to the Chamber of Commerce.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is very simple. Pregnant workers should be able to request reasonable accommodations—a stool, a water bottle, a bathroom break—when such an accommodation would help them remain at work safely during their pregnancy and so they can return to work after childbirth. Other accommodations that a pregnant worker might request include, but are not limited to, light duty, temporary transfer, additional or more flexible breaks, changing food or drink policies, time off to recover from childbirth, accommodations for lactation needs, and flexible scheduling.

The bill is intended to help women like Peggy Young, a UPS driver who requested light duty while she was pregnant. Peggy was denied her request, even though other workers had received light duty, because there is no requirement under the 1978 Pregnancy Discrimination Act to provide reasonable accommodations. She was forced onto unpaid leave and eventually took her case all the way to the Supreme Court. She won, but the ruling did not provide full protections to the millions of workers who get pregnant each year. That is why we need the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, so that every pregnant worker will be able to request an accommodation without fear of being fired or forced on leave, when all she needs is a stool or a bathroom break.

Young did not solve this issue, and the standard is still unworkable for employers and pregnant workers. After Young, over two-thirds of women still lost their Pregnancy Discrimination Act pregnancy accommodation claims in court, mostly because they were unable to find a suitable comparator under the Young comparator framework. Pregnant workers need immediate relief to remain healthy and on the job. Pregnant workers should not have to muster evidence and identify someone else at work to get their own medically necessary accommodation, as basic as a stool or extra restroom breaks. Pregnant workers, especially in low-wage industries, usually do not have access to their coworkers' personnel files and do not know how all their coworkers are being treated.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would create a clear, explicit right to accommodations, allowing pregnant workers to remain healthy and attached to the workforce. It is a solution that provides clarity to both employers and employees. That is why the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and other business groups support the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act sets up a simple framework that is easily understood and utilized by both employers and employees. Under the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, a pregnant employee may request reasonable accommodations from their employer, the same process that individuals with disabilities use under the Americans with Disabilities Act. Employers are familiar with it, the interactive process is easier for both the worker and the employer.